

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1-2 and 4-17 remain standing in this application. Claims 1, 6, 9, 11, 14 and 16 have been amended. Claims 18-27 were previously withdrawn. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102

At page 2, paragraph 3 of the Office Action claims 1, 2, and 4-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Number US 2002/0177460 (“Beasley”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

Although Applicant disagrees with the broad grounds of rejection set forth in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 9, 11, 14 and 16 in order to facilitate prosecution on the merits. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at paragraphs [0050] – [0063] and in Figure 6, for example. Applicant submits that the amendments merely clarify, either expressly or impliedly, what was already present in the claims. Furthermore, Applicant submits that the amendments are not narrowing amendments and are not being made for reasons substantially related to patentability.

In view of the above recited amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 6, 9, 11, 14 and 16 is respectfully requested. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection with respect to

claims 2, 4-5, 7-8, 10, 12-13, 15 and 17 that depend from claim 1, 6, 9, 11, 14 and 16, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims.

Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-2 and 4-17 recite novel features and that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited reference based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

It is believed that claims 1-2 and 4-17 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-9338 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Appl. No. 10/686,959
Response Dated August 11, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of May 11, 2006

Docket No.: 1020.P16717
Examiner: Yang, Clara I
TC/A.U. 2612

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to the credit card in the previously filed credit card authorization form.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

/John F. Kacvinsky/
John F. Kacvinsky, Reg. No. 40,040
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: August 11, 2006

4500 Brooktree Road, Suite 102
Wexford, PA 15090

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being eFiled with the United States Patent and Trademark Office:

Date of Submission: August 11, 2006

Filed By: Robert Vincent Racunas/ Deborah Higham